

REMARKS

Applicants' representative wishes to thank Examiner Mutschler for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview conducted January 15, 2004. Aside from Examiner Mutschler, participants in this interview included Bulent Basol, Halit Yakupoglu, and the undersigned. Paul Lindquist was not in attendance as the Interview Summary dated January 29, 2004 indicates.

As briefly discussed during the interview, the title of this application was amended by way of the Reply filed March 25, 2003, and should now properly read --APPARATUS FOR CONTROLLING THICKNESS UNIFORMITY OF ELECTROPLATED AND ELECTROETCHED LAYERS--.

Claims 3 and 26 are allowed.

Claim 74 is amended as discussed during the interview to specify --electroetching-- rather than "electropolishing" and the rejection set forth in section 8 on pages 3-4 of the Office Action should be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 67, and 69 are amended above in the manner discussed during the interview and after consideration of the comments provided by the Examiner in section 10 on pages 4-5 of the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that all of the claims in this application now fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 13 is now allowable in view of the comments provided in section 19 on page 14 of the Office Action.

The informalities referred to by the Examiner in section 11 on page 5 of the Office Action are eliminated above.


Claim 7 is amended above in the manner discussed during the interview and now reflects that relative motion is established between the mask and the surface of the substrate during processing. As tentatively agreed during the interview, currently amended claim 7 is patentable over the Galik patent disclosure for this reason. Dependent claims 8, 9, 12, 14, and 19 are also patentable over the Galik patent disclosure.

Independent claims 1, 7, 20, and 57 are amended above in the manner discussed during the interview. As tentatively agreed during the interview, the Stone, Edelstein, and Jorne et al. patent disclosures, taken as a whole, do not suggest the subject matter of any of currently amended claims 1, 7, 20, and 57. That subject matter is also not suggested by the secondary references discussed in sections 16-17 on pages 10-14 of the Office Action, and currently amended claims 1, 7, 20, and 57 are patentable. All claims depending on claims 1, 7, 20, and 57 are patentable as well.

All claims now in this application are patentable, and this application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions after considering this Reply, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 3, 2004



Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, D.C. 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:msy